From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: MARK I. NAHNSEN BARNES & TORNBURG P.O.BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786 Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below Separagraph 2 below Of January 2004 (6s.01.2004) Applicant application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/US04/00284 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; F24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US Cl.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277, 35/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326 Applicant 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application EPO - DG 1 Sox No. VIII Certain observations on the international application EPO - DG 1 Certain observations on the international application EPO - DG 1 Applicant Eleminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose description of the control of the position of the posi					
PCT					
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORS (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference 923446-95343 International application No.					
Applicant's or agent's file reference 923446-95343 International application No.					
Applicant's or agent's file reference 923446-95343 International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) PCT/USO4/00284 O6 January 2004 (06.01.2004) PCT/USO4/00284 O6 January 2004 (06.01.2004) PCT/USO4/00284 O6 January 2004 (06.01.2004) PCT/USO4/00284 O6 January 2004 (06.01.2004) O6 January 2003 (06.01.2003) International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC PC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; P24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US C1.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277, 95/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326 Applicant J.B.I., IP 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application PCP - DG 1 2 8, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered (107) a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
See paragraph 2 below	2004				
S23446-95343 International application No.					
PCT/US04/00284 06 January 2004 (06.01.2004) 06 January 2003 (06.01.2003) International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; F24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US Cl.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277, 95/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326 Applicant J.B.I., IP 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application EPO - DG 1 28. 10. 2604 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107% written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; F24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US Cl.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277,95/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326 Applicant J.B.I., IP 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application EPO - DG 1 2 8, 10, 2604 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered for applicant choose international apply where the applicant choose	ar)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; F24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US Cl.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277,95/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326 Applicant J.B.I., IP 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application EPO - DG 1 2 8, 10, 2604 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to applicant choose international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	03)				
Applicant J.B.I., IP 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion	1,253,277,350;				
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 28, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered in the applicant choose international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application 28. 10. 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2 8, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	Box No. I Basis of the opinion				
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 28, 10, 2604 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	Box No. II Priority				
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 28, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107 a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2 8, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107 a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention				
Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 28. 10. 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 107 a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2 8, 10, 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	No. VI Certain documents cited				
2 6, 10. 2004 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered (107) a written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose	1				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to written opinion of International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant choose					
Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.12 that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.	cant chooses an				
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	rom the date of				
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.					
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Authorized officer					
Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Mail Stop PCT, Ann. ISA/US Commissioner for Patents Authorized officer Jerry A. Lorengo	thild				

Telephone No. (571) 272-1700

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/00284

Box No. I Basis of this opinion	
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international applicatio	n in the language in which
it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.	
This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the f which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rul	
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	on and necessary to the
a. type of material	
a sequence listing	of the second
table(s) related to the sequence listing	
b. format of material	, ¹ , ⁵⁸
in written format	
in computer readable form	
c. time of filing/furnishing	
contained in international application as filed.	:
filed together with the international application in computer readable form.	
furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table r filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional cop the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnish	oies is identical to that in
4. Additional comments:	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/00284

Claims NONE				
Novelty (N) Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Inventive step (IS) Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims NONE 2. Citations and explanations: Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject mate	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule applicability; citations and expla	e 43 bis.1(a)(i anations supp) with regard to novelty orting such statement	, inventive step or industrial
Inventive step (IS) Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims 1-22 YE Claims 1-22 YE Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject material applic	1. Statement			
Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject material appli	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-22	YES
Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the pr art of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.		Claims	NONE	NO
Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-22 Claims NONE Claims NONE Claims 1-22 Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the pract of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-22	YES
Claims NONE 2. Citations and explanations: Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.				NO
Claims NONE 2. Citations and explanations: Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.	Total Company of the Company	.		, ama
2. Citations and explanations: Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject material set out in PCT Article 33(4).	Industrial applicability (IA)			YES NO
Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the pract of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.			NONE	
spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeReg Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prart of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15 Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter.	2. Citations and explanations:			
	art of record specifically teaches or suggests the appendix elaims set forth in applicant claims Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article	paratus capable 1, 9 and 15 e 33(4), and thu	of operating on aircraft and	d having the particular sidewall and

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

	ANATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITI	PC1/US04/0U284		
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application			
The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:				
The drawings are line and include h	objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under and-drawn element numbers and Figure labels.	PCT Article 7 because: the drawings are faint of		
		•		